REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 18 will be pending upon entry of this amendment.

Claims 3-17 and 19 are canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1 and 18 are independent claims.

I. EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants' attorney appreciates the opportunity to speak with the Examiner during the October 25, 2004 telephonic Examiner Interview. During the interview, claims 1, 2, and 18 were discussed. Agreement was reached to elect claims 1, 2, and 18 for prosecution and that such claims read on the species of Figure 2. No prior art was discussed.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,355,321 (hereinafter "Grodstein"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Grodstein does not appear to disclose the features of the present invention. Specifically, Grodstein does not appear to show a method "allowing *one or more latches* of the circuit design to be *locally* treated as exhibiting latch transparency during modeling of the timing behavior of the circuit design" (emphasis added), as recited in independent claim 1. Claim 18 recites a similar claim feature.

Applicants describe in the Specification at least at Page 8, lines 2-25 and Page 9, lines 8-13 an example of locally treating latches as transparent during modeling. Specifically, Applicants' Specification describes the method of allowing one or more latches of the circuit design to be locally treated as

exhibiting latch transparency in that "the designer may easily add transparency to latches at a local level by specifying a delay value for the local clock that is coupled to the latches." Additionally, Applicants recite that "one or more latches" exhibit latch transparency. Accordingly, "every latch of the circuit design need not be treated as transparent during modeling." (Applicants' Specification, Page 3, lines 28-29) Applicants respectfully submit the method as claimed in independent claim 1 and the computer program product of independent claim 18 allow the user to select which latches are to be treated as transparent during modeling.

In contrast, Grodstein does not appear to teach or show locally treating latches as transparent. Rather, Grodstein appears to show a system which *globally* treats latches as transparent. See Grodstein, Col. 1, lines 57-63 and Col. 8, lines 15-38. As Applicants understand Grodstein, the reference does not appear to show any method for providing a delay value to individually treat a latch as transparent as discussed above. As such, the system of Grodstein appears to *globally* assert latch transparency instead of "allowing one or more latches of the circuit design to be *locally* treated as exhibiting latch transparency," as recited in Applicants' claim 1. Grodstein further appears to show that *all* latches will exhibit transparency during modeling. Grodstein, at Col. 8, lines 18-19, states "some latches will be transparent once per clock cycle, some several times." Grodstein goes on to describe the frequency with which *all* latches become transparent. See, for example, Grodstein, Col. 8, lines 29-38. As such, Grodstein does not appear to show a method that "allow[s] one or more latches of the circuit design to be locally treated as exhibiting latch transparency," as recited in independent claim 1.

For the above reasons, the Grodstein patent does not appear to disclose "allowing one or more latches of the circuit

design to be locally treated as exhibiting latch transparency during modeling of the timing behavior of the circuit design" as recited by claim 1. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit claims 1 and 18, and Claim 2, which depends from independent claim 1, are not anticipated by Grodstein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims.

III. CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe the claims are now in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the same.

A separate Request for a One-Month Extension of Time is enclosed herewith, with authorization to charge the requisite extension fee to Deposit Account No. 04-1696. Applicants do not believe any other fees are due regarding this amendment. If any fees are required, however, please charge Deposit Account No. 04-1696. The Applicants encourage the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney should any issues remain.

Respectfully Submitted,

Brian M. Dugan, Esq.
Registration No. 41,720
Dugan & Dugan, PC
Attorneys for Applicants
(914) 332-9081

Dated: March 14, 2005
Tarrytown, New York